

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-19 are pending in the application, with claims 1 and 11 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 6, and 11 are sought to be amended. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejection under Obviousness type Double Patenting

On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 11 based on non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1 and 17 of U.S. Patent No. 7,123,349 in view of U.S. Application No. 2002/0074635 to Hattori *et al.*

Applicants respectfully request that the currently asserted double patenting rejection be held in abeyance until claimed subject matter is otherwise deemed allowable. After analyzing the final allowed claim scope, Applicants will consider filing a terminal disclaimer if necessary to overcome an obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 4, 5, 9, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0024645 to Nakano

Reply to Office Action of September 16, 2008

VAN GROOS *et al.*
Appl. No. 10/797,664

("Nakano") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0074635 to Hattori *et al.* ("Hattori"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Amended claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "wherein the handler has either a plurality of protrusions or a plurality of grooves that substantially correspond to and engage, respectively, a plurality of grooves or a plurality of protrusions located on the machine part." Applicants submit that neither Nakano nor Hattori, whether taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest a handler nor a machine part with corresponding protrusions and grooves that engage. Claims 4, 5, 9, and 10 each ultimately depend from claim 1 and are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 and in further view of their respective features. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 4, 5, 9, and 10, and allowance thereof.

Claim 1-5 and 9-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0045131 to Verbeke *et al.* ("Verbeke") in view of Hattori. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Amended claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "wherein the handler has either a plurality of protrusions or a plurality of grooves that substantially correspond to and engage, respectively, a plurality of grooves or a plurality of protrusions located on the machine part." Amended claim 11 recites features similar to claim 1. Applicants submit that neither Verbeke nor Hattori, whether taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest a handler or a machine part with corresponding protrusions and grooves that engage. Claims 2-5 and 9-10 each ultimately depend from claim 1 and claims 12-16 each ultimately depend from claim 11, and are patentable for at least the same reasons as claims 1 and 11, respectively, and in further view of their respective features. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request

reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-5 and 9-16, and allowance thereof.

Claims 6-8 and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Nakano in view of Hattori as applied to claims 1 and 11, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,825,470 to Miyai *et al.* ("Miyai"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Amended claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "wherein the handler has either a plurality of protrusions or a plurality of grooves that substantially correspond to and engage, respectively, a plurality of grooves or a plurality of protrusions located on the machine part." Amended claim 11 recites features similar to claim 1. Applicants submit that none of Nakano, Hattori or Miyai, whether taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest a handler or a machine part with corresponding protrusions and grooves that engage. Claims 6-8 and 18 each ultimately depend from claim 1 and claims 17 and 19 ultimately depend from claim 11, and are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 and 11, respectively, and in further view of their respective features. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 6-8 and 17-19, and allowance thereof.

Claims 6-8 and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Verbeke in view of Hattori as applied to claims 1 and 11, and further in view Miyai. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Amended claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "wherein the handler has either a plurality of protrusions or a plurality of grooves that substantially correspond to and engage, respectively, a plurality of grooves or a plurality of protrusions located on the machine part." Amended

claim 11 recites features similar to claim 1. Applicants submit that none of Verbeke, Hattori or Miyai, whether taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest a handler or a machine part with corresponding protrusions and grooves that engage. Claims 6-8 and 18 each ultimately depend from claim 1 and claims 17 and 19 ultimately depend from claim 11, and are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 and 11, respectively, and in further view of their respective features. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 6-8 and 17-19, and allowance thereof.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections of claims 1-19 be withdrawn and the claims be passed to allowance.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Michelle K. Holoubek
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 54,179

Date: December 8, 2008

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

882766_1.DOC